

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested. Claims 5-29 are in this application. Claims 5, 7, 10, and 15-20 have been amended. Claims 1-4 have been cancelled. Claims 21-29 have added to additionally claim the present invention.

Applicant requests the Examiner to indicate whether FIGS. 1A, 1B, and 2A-2H of the substitute formal drawings filed on October 17, 2003 (and received by the PTO on October 20, 2003) have been entered into the application. Applicant notes that in the next communication following receipt of the drawings, applicant is to be notified by the Examiner if the drawings have been entered and, if not entered, applicant should receive an explanation as to why the drawings were not entered. (See MPEP §608.02(h).)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,820). The Examiner also rejected claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cheng et al. (U.S. 2003/0038298 A1). The Examiner further rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lai et al. (U.S. 2003/0234405 A1).

As noted above, claims 1-4 have been cancelled. In addition, claim 5 has been amended so that claims 5-6 depend either directly or indirectly from objected-to claim 7. Claim 16 has been amended to include the limitation recited in objected-to claim 10, and is therefore believed to be patentable for the same reasons as objected-to claim 10. In addition, since claims 17-19 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 16, claims 17-19 are patentable for the same reasons as claim 16.

With respect to new claim 21, this claim recites, in part,

“the second semiconductor region contacting and surrounding the first semiconductor region.”

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner pointed to the middle P+ region formed in n-well PCLSCR 2 shown in FIG. 5C of Ker as constituting the first semiconductor region of the claims, and the adjacent N+ region shown in FIG. 5C of Ker as constituting the second semiconductor region of the claims. However, as shown in FIG. 5C, Ker fails to teach that the N+ region both contacts and surrounds the middle P+ region. As a result, claim 21 is not anticipated by Ker.

With respect to Cheng, the Examiner pointed to the middle P+ region formed in the left-most n-well shown in FIG. 6 of Cheng as constituting the first semiconductor region of the claims, and the adjacent N+ region shown in FIG. 6 of Cheng as constituting the second semiconductor region of the claims. However, as shown in FIG. 6, Cheng fails to teach that the N+ region both contacts and surrounds the middle P+ region. As a result, claim 21 is not anticipated by Cheng.

With respect to Lai, the Examiner pointed to P+ region 432 shown in FIGS. 5 and 6 of Lai as constituting the first semiconductor region of the claims, and N+ region 430 shown in FIGS. 5 and 6 of Lai as constituting the second semiconductor region of the claims. However, as shown in FIGS. 5 and 6, Lai fails to teach that N+ region 430 both contacts and surrounds P+ region 432. As a result, claim 21 is not anticipated by Lai. Further, since claims 22-29 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 21, claims 22-29 are patentable over Ker, Cheng, and Lai for the same reasons as claim 21.

The Examiner objected to claims 7-15, but indicated that claims 7-15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 has been amended to be in

10/676,531

PATENT

independent form and is believed to include all of the limitations of claims 1-4, but not the limitations of claim 5 from which claim 7 originally depended.

Claim 10 has been amended to be in independent form and is believed to include all of the limitations of claims 1-3. In addition, claim 15 has been amended to be in independent form and is believed to include all of the limitations of claims 1-4. Further, claim 20 has been amended to be in independent form and is believed to include all of the limitations of claims 16-17.

Thus, for the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that all of the claims are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, the Examiner's early re-examination and reconsideration are respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 06-16-04

By: Mark C. Pickering  
Mark C. Pickering  
Registration No. 36,239  
Attorney for Assignee

P.O. Box 300  
Petaluma, CA 94953-0300  
Telephone: (707) 762-5500  
Facsimile: (707) 762-5504  
Customer No. 33402